

PATENT APPLICATION

042390.P12399

Request for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136

Assignee herewith petitions the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to extend the time for response to the Office Action dated February 28, 2003 for 3 month(s) from May 28, 2003 to August 28, 2003.

Please charge Deposit Account #02-2666 in the amount of:

_____	(\$110.00 for a one month extension)
_____	(\$410.00 for a two month extension)
<u> X </u>	(\$930.00 for a three month extension)
_____	(\$1,450.00 for a four month extension)

to cover the cost of the extension.

Remarks

Reexamination and reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-20 remain in the application. No new claims have been added or canceled.

Support for Amendments

As indicated above, claims 1, 13, and 18 have been amended. Support for the amendments is shown at least by the examples illustrated in the figure and described on page 4, lines 16-21.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Drawing Changes

The Office Action objected to the drawings per 37 C.F.R. §1.83 stating that a second wire bond electrically coupling at least a portion of the passive component to the integrated circuit must be shown. Accordingly, Applicants have submitted

PATENT APPLICATION

042390.P12399

proposed changes to the figures in order to comply with the Examiner's objection. When the proposed drawing changes are approved by the Examiner, and after a Notice of Allowance has been received, Applicants will submit formal drawings incorporating the approved corrections.

Response to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection

The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 2, 4-10, and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Spielberg et al. (US 6,005,778). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

As indicated above, claims 1 and 13 recite a voltage regulator circuit. As stated on page 4, lines 9-10, of the Office Action, "Spielberger does not disclose a voltage regulator coupled to the integrated circuit die." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Response to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

The Office Action also rejects claims 12, 18, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Spielberg et al. in view of Figueroa et al. (US 6,346,743). Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

1) THE INDEPENDENT CLAIMS INCLUDE LIMITATIONS THAT ARE NOT TAUGHT OR SUGGESTED BY THE COMBINATION OF SPIELBERGER ET AL. AND FIGUEROA ET AL.

It is well established that obviousness requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim (M.P.E.P. §2142). Without

PATENT APPLICATION

042390.P12399

conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Spielberger et al. and Figueroa et al. does not meet the requirements of an obvious rejection in that neither teaches nor suggests a voltage regulator circuit that provides a voltage to program or change the state of a non-volatile memory cell.

As noted in the Office Action, Spielberger et al. does not teach a voltage regulator circuit. In addition, Applicant would like to respectfully point out that Figueroa et al. does not teach or suggest this feature as well. In particular Figueroa et al. states at column 3, lines 25-30 that the capacitors are "... operatively coupled as bypass capacitors... so as to decouple power noise signals." Also, "These capacitors are intended to prevent the voltage from dropping below some present reference level (e.g., typically set by the voltage regulator module (VRM))." (see column 4, lines 39-42.

Since Spielberger et al. and Figueroa et al., taken separately, are devoid of any teaching or suggestion of the limitations recited in claims 1 and 18 the combination Spielberger et al. and Figueroa et al. must necessarily be devoid of the required teaching or suggestion of all the elements recited in claims 1 or 18. Consequently, the combination cannot make Applicants' claims 1 or 18 obvious. Since claims 12 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 18, respectively, Applicants believe the rejection of these claims has been overcome for at least the same reason.

Applicants would like to emphasize that the preceding paragraphs were not intended to attack Spielberger et al. and Figueroa et al. separately. But instead, Applicants have shown how each is devoid of claimed elements so that, by default, the combination is also devoid of at least some of the features of Applicants' claimed invention.

PATENT APPLICATION**042390.P12399**

With respect to claim 20, Applicants respectfully submits that Sundstram does not teach the same feature, and thus, cannot be obvious for the same reason.

Additional arguments to distinguish the cited patents from the claims, as amended, could have been made, but it is believed that the foregoing discussion is sufficient to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 29 2003

PATENT APPLICATION

042390.P12399

GROUP 2800

OFFICIALConclusion


The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed February 28, 2003, and it is submitted that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of amended claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should it be determined that an additional fee is due under 37 CFR §§1.6 or 1.17, or any excess fee has been received, please charge that fee or credit the amount of overcharge to deposit account #02-2666.

If the Examiner believes that there are any informalities which can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (480) 554-9732 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Eleanor P. Rabadam et al:



Kenneth M. Seddon
Senior Patent Attorney
Reg. No. 43,105

Dated: 8/28/03

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd., Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 264-0967



042390.12399
Babadam et al.

6L
approved
12/1/03

100